



California Biodiversity Council  
Watershed Workgroup  
Meeting Minutes

**Purpose of the meeting:**

To reflect on past accomplishments and redirect for the future.

**Outcomes for the meeting:** We intend to leave this meeting with:

- Feeling of accomplishment for past projects
- Understanding of the future direction of the workgroup
- Formation of subtask forces to accomplish workgroup goals.

**Meeting Leaders:** Diane Holcomb (NRCS) and Maria Rea (Resources Agency)

**Facilitator:** Renee Hoyos (Resources Agency)

**Attendees:**

Dennis Heiman (RWQCB 5), Gail Newton (DFG), Seline Jacobs (JSA), Mike Chapel (USFS), Michael Bird (DFG/NAFWB), Fraser Schilling (UC Davis), Greg Gauthier (Coastal Watershed Council), J.R. Flores (NRCS), Jennifer Wilcox (Sonoma Co. Water Agency), Ben Wallace (Ca. Wilderness Coalition), Chip Wollbrandt (Price, Postel and Parma), Russ Henly (CDF), Kristin Cooper-Carter (CSU, Chico), Suzanne Gibbs (Big Chico Creek Alliance), Ken Coulter (SWRCB), Dennis Bowker (SRWP), Allen Harthorn (SRWP), Erin Klaesius (CBC), Mark Hite (CDF), Nettie Drake (P/SC CRMP), Fraser Sime (DWR), Sari Sommarstrom (UC, Berkeley), Kevin Ward (ICE, UC Davis), Bill Cunningham (USDA/NRCS), Caitlin Cornwall (Sonoma Ecology Center), Richard Dale, Mary Lee Knecht (JSA), Jim Edmondson (CalTrout).

Date: July 13, 2001    Time: 10:00 am – 3:00 pm    Location: NRCS, Davis

<b>Meeting Agenda</b>	
<b>Agenda Items/Intended Outcomes</b>	<b>Results, Decisions</b>
<i>Agenda</i>	Agenda adopted with no changes
<i>Review Accomplishments</i> <i>-Watershed Principles/Issues</i>	See attachment. Most of the principles are being address by the workgroup.
<i>Revisit Chico CBC Meeting</i> <i>-Request for Task Force to address Permit/Regulatory Coordination</i>	CBC WWG formed a task force to assist with permit/regulatory coordination. Contact Maria Rea – 916.635.5656
<i>Funding Issue White Paper</i>	Congratulations all around
<i>WWG Updates</i> <i>-Funding Database</i>  <i>-Fund Manager's Work Group</i>  <i>-Technical Assistance Matrix</i> <i>-Watershed Assessment Manual</i>   <i>-Watershed ID Signs</i>   <i>-CCRISP</i>	<p>On-line this fall. Will be beta-testing with local groups. Contact Kristin Cooper-Carter - 707.893-5751</p> <p>Recommendations from the group regarding performance measures: no technical terms, provide workshops for locals on what a performance measure is, outline the differences between programmatic/legislative and project measures.</p> <p>See attachment. Contact: Renee Hoyos – 916.653.9205</p> <p>See attached.</p> <p>Recommendations from the group regarding watershed assessment manual: need to define what a watershed assessment is and all agencies should agree to it and it's format, possibly create two documents, a quick fix and a longer, more detailed one. Questions? Contact Russ Henly at - 916.227.2659</p> <p>Caltrans waived encroachment fee. There is a one month turnaround on sign development. Folks got to vote for the design. Questions arose on which watershed designation to use (Calwater, HUC etc) Contact Mark Hite for questions at – 916.653-1604</p> <p>For questions contact Marc Hoshovsky at 916.322.2446</p>
<i>Related Projects – Updates</i> <i>-Ca. Joint Task Force on Watershed Management</i> <i>-NRPI</i>	<p>See attached. Contact Ken Coulter - 916.341.5496</p> <p>Recommendations from the group regarding NRPI: Define watershed project for the</p>

<p>-CalFed</p> <p>-Next CBC Meeting</p>	<p>database. It is not standardized. Contact Kevin Ward – 530.752.2378</p> <p>The charter is approved. Completed the funding awards for this year. 54/83 projects selected for funding, ~\$18M awarded. MOU is making the rounds for signatures. Contact John Lowrie - 916.653.5422.</p> <p>Yosemite in October, Stockton in Nov. Contact Mike Chapel - 530.478.6203</p>
<p>Next Steps</p> <p>Participants identified projects that they would like to take on and divided themselves up into subtask forces. Some of you were signed up in absentia. Don't panic. It only means you're well thought of.</p> <p>STF leaders will contact their teams to arrange meetings. The next CBC WWG meeting will be in October and will be an opportunity to update the rest of the group on progress of the task forces.</p>	<p>SubTask Force on:</p> <p><b>Project Director's Manual –</b> Lead: Kristin Cooper-Carter 707.893-5751 Liza Prunuske</p> <p><b>California Watershed Agenda –</b> Lead: Maria Rea – 916.653.5656, Greg Gauthier, Mary Lee Knecht, Sari Sommarstrom, Dennis Heiman, J.R. Flores, Fraser Sime, Anjanette Martin.</p> <p><b>Permit Coordination –</b> Lead: Cathy Blier/Maria Rea, Kristin Cooper-Carter, Kevin Ward, Diane Holcomb, Dennis Heiman, Gail Newton.</p> <p><b>Watershed Planning Handbook –</b> Lead: Renee Hoyos 916.653.9205, Julie McIver</p> <p><b>Natural Resource Projects Inventory –</b> Lead: Kevin Ward 530.752.2378, Renee Hoyos, Diane Holcomb, Ben Wallace</p> <p><b>YOU CAN STILL SIGN UP FOR A TASK FORCE. CONTACT THE GROUP LEADER FOR DETAILS.</b></p>
<p>Next meeting</p>	<p>October 2001 Exact date to be announced later.</p>

# ***Mission of the CBC Watershed Workgroup***

***To facilitate watershed restoration and conservation through coordination of statewide projects, policies, funding and support of local efforts.***

## **Priorities of the California Biodiversity Watershed Work Group**

1. Provide a forum for discussing trends in watershed management, e.g. specific legislative proposals, ideas from the field, etc. and regularly provide an update on these trends to the full CBC Council
2. Advise the Resources Agency and State Water Resources Control Board (and other agencies) on development of a “Watershed Agenda” which serves to integrate current crosscutting activities on watershed and provide future strategic direction.
3. Analyze and develop recommendations for coordinating watershed restoration funding in order to increase effectiveness and make the process more user-friendly (e.g. develop a joint application process for RFPs, address funding gap/cash flow issues, develop user friendly, integrated reporting requirement(s).
4. Develop recommendations for agencies that guide interaction with non-agency groups, specifically address proposal to have points of contact or “watershed teams” at the basin scale.
5. Develop recommendations for addressing barriers to permitting through coordination of agency actions.

## Update on Fund Manager's Meeting Progress

### **BFP #1 Streamline the Application and Project Selection Process**

- Within 5 years, develop a common pre-proposal to be used by major funding programs.
- Incorporate common requirements for monitoring, evaluation, and database entry into Requests for Proposals or other funding documents.
- Each separate funding program should develop a checklist to assist applicants in targeting appropriate sources of funding.
- Coordinate funding schedules and cycles to be mindful of matching opportunities.

#### *A. Pre-proposal form*

The pre-proposal form might have another life as a 'cover sheet' for grants that is universal. Watershed groups will still have to fill out the myriad of forms for project approval, but the basics can be covered on the 'cover sheet'.

#### *B. Common Requirements*

***This BFP was not discussed as it was seen to be out of place. It will be reconsidered in another forum.***

#### *C. Checklist*

The Chico Funding Database will assist in providing a one-stop shopping place for watershed groups on the prowl for funding. By incorporating checklists in the keyword list, groups can find appropriate matches for their projects. The database can provide a link to the funder's webpage to get pertinent information and download forms.

DWR, DFG and CalFed use checklists to help applicants complete the forms, not to see if the project is a fit.

#### *D. Coordinating funding schedules*

The manager's in the meeting try on an informal level to be mindful of coordinating funding with other agencies. Some concern was expressed about the amount of responsibility watershed groups want agencies to assume. Assuming that one agency will pass an application for funding to another agency is out of the realm of possibility. Watershed groups must apply formally. The agencies are willing to direct and assist groups with potential funding opportunities.

### **BFP #2 Administer Funds More Efficiently**

- Agencies should examine internal procedures to release fund in a more timely manner and/or provide up front costs where possible.
  - Assist applicants in planning timing of grant to correspond to limited field season.
  - Provide sufficient but not excessive administrative and management support for grants
  - Assist recipients in developing good project management and administrative skills.
- Encourage small applicants to pool administrative resources.

#### *Agency accomplishments*

DOC – After discovering that Department of Pesticide Regulation was giving a percentage of funds up front, they decided to do the same. They also provide monies for overhead.

DWR – The Urban Streams Grant program pays in installments. Since they were a ‘pass through’ agency for Prop 13, they were able to provide funding in advance (ask Sarah what %)

SWRCB – 25% of prop 13 monies were given up front.

CalFed – They merge federal and state monies in a unique arrangement on a reimbursable schedule.

BLM – The feds can provide upfront money.

#### **Potential future actions**

Investigate the feasibility of providing funds upfront and paying out the funds in a timely fashion. Potentially, work together to change legislation to allow for a more flexible payment schedule.

#### **BFP #3 Improve Reporting and Accountability**

- Develop a common statewide project database using NRPI as a model.
- Develop common standard performance measures for watershed projects.

The fund managers met with the Office of Innovation for a workshop on performance measures. Russ Snyder spoke on the definition of a performance measure, how to apply them appropriately to a program and how to evaluate them. The group is working on an insert that will be added to granting program materials to educate applicants on how their work will be evaluated.

#### **BFP #4 Provide Technical Assistance and Outreach**

- Host collaborative, regional workshops to explain programs.
- Provide inter-agency collaborative technical training to encourage high quality projects.
- Increase the number of agency field staff available to assist with watershed programs.

Most agencies are working to improve the numbers of field experts available to watershed groups. The issues of technical outreach will be discussed by Dennis Bowker.

#### **BFP#5 Address Regional And Economic Differences**

- Ensure that there is sufficient staff to assist in all regions of the state.
- Include local and /or regional review as a primary step in making funding decisions.

This BFP was largely in response to the LA area’s feelings that they are being left out of funding and that committees largely staffed by groups with N. California bias make the decisions.

### **Agency accomplishments**

DFG – 4 new hires in the Central Southern part of the state

DWR - 1 new hire in the LA Area

DOC – has regional meetings with RCD

CDF (Forest Legacy Program)– For this agency the LA area gets a lot of money for fire control, yet there is little forest ecosystems in the region for acquisition.

CalFed – has a broad range of representation on their committees.

NRCS – uses the districts to garner local support

**Though this group feels that support for the LA region is improving, the overwhelming response is that there is not enough staff to meet the range of needs in the state.**

### **BFP #6 Ensure Funding Decisions are Based on Sound Science**

- Require technical review of applications. Ensure that there is no conflict of interest.

### **Agency accomplishments**

All agencies technically review applications as required by law. However, the level of depth of that review varies with time and staff resources. **We were unclear about what is a conflict of interest.**

### **BFP #7 Leverage Multiple Funding Sources**

- Leverage private fund through public-private partnerships.

### **Agency accomplishments**

All agencies leverage federal, state and local monies either by law or informally.

### **Potential future actions**

An added function for the Funding database can be the ability for watershed groups to leverage private funds through partnerships.

NRPI can also play a role in helping groups in the same geographic region with the same interests find each other.

### **BFP #8 Educate Policy Makers**

- Produce an interagency succinct public relations document highlighting watershed concepts and success stories.
- Conduct public forums and meetings targeting policy makers.
- Each program should document successful case studies.

### **Agency accomplishments**

All agencies feel that they are keeping the policy makers in the loop. Here are some examples of those efforts:

CBC Meetings – these meetings are local public forums attended by local, state and federal policy makers.

CBC Meetings with CSAC – the CBC is considering branching out to include other regional organizations.

CBC Meetings with RCRC – The CBC has been meeting yearly with this regional group.

### **Potential future actions**

CalFed offered to pay for a public relations document. This effort later became the Wayne Watershed Bill. Very possibly this report can be turned into the document

DOC – created a document with CaRCD. Apparently, there is a video floating around created with the CaRCD. **Does anyone know where it is?**



## Technical Assistance for Watershed Management

There has been a rapid increase in local watershed management activity in California in the past decade. As the number and diversity of local efforts have grown, the demand on existing available technical expertise has also grown exponentially. There is a need to reassess our present mechanisms and assumptions about how agency expertise interacts with local community management initiatives. We have begun that process through conducting a “needs assessment” and comparing the stated needs with available assets to meet those needs. There are multiple levels at which that comparison can be made: statewide, regional, and sub-regional. Each scale will produce different results.

A brief examination shows evidence that there are significant gaps in the availability of technical assistance as a service to communities. Most assistance presently is available only through defined programs, and only according to the needs and boundaries of those programs. Program assistance works well with point source pollution and cleaning/fixing past problems, but service-oriented assistance is necessary to improve management of resources to avoid problems in the future. In some cases, such assistance is virtually unavailable in any circumstance. There are several apparent reasons that assistance has evolved from service-oriented delivery to bounded program delivery over the past few decades. The needs that prompted the evolution still remain, and must be addressed in any new initiative to re-establish service-oriented assistance. I have attempted to outline those issues below.

In developing any type of service-oriented technical assistance delivery mechanism to interact with local communities, the following issues must be addressed and answers defined:

1. Accountability: One significant need that has resulted in programmatic delivery has been the need to clarify and quantify the use of public funds for their intended purpose. The accountability issue is an important one that will require a lot of thought. Some subsets of the issue are –
  - a) Who will receive the service, and how will those recipients be chosen?
  - b) To what extent will service be offered, and how will that be determined?
  - c) What success measurements, or job performance criteria, will apply in order to determine the effectiveness/responsiveness of the service?
  - d) To whom and for what will the service personnel be accountable?
2. Priorities: There will be several points where priorities will have to be established in order for the service to be dependable and reasonably predictable. Some points –
  - a) Geographic delivery priorities
  - b) Topical delivery priorities (what type of assistance is delivered)
  - c) Recipient category priorities (local groups, individuals, local government, tribes, institutions, not for profit corporations, etc.)
3. Organization: In order that the technical assistance remain effective and responsive to needs, several organizational questions need to be addressed.

- a) What type of communication network, focused team, or other means can be developed to provide coordination and equitable distribution of workload and service provided?
  - b) How will the available services be “advertised” – how will they be connected with actual local needs on a specific basis?
  - c) Some form of training should be delivered at start-up and frequently thereafter to keep skills current. Teamwork, collaboration, technical advances, etc., will all need to be covered on a regular basis.
4. Long term effectiveness: Much of the presently available technical assistance from both government and private sources tends to be short term. When a project is done or a program is complete, the expertise that was brought in leaves, and all that remains is a report or a completed project. How can this “assistance as a service” be developed to leave increased technical competency in the local watershed when the service providers leave? Just as important, how can we ensure that the service providers also become better educated regarding local needs and capacities? One major objective of this effort should be to raise the level of expertise at all levels. That will require some form of overt continuing education for “teachers” and “students” alike.

Dennis Bowker, Coordinator  
Sacramento River Watershed Program  
7/13/01

*UPDATE ON "WAYNE BILL - AB 2117" & THE NEW  
CALIFORNIA JOINT TASK FORCE ON WATERSHED MANAGEMENT*

---

This bill requires the Secretary of the Resources Agency and the State Water Resources Control Board to select at least 3 watershed protection projects in order to evaluate the existing collaborative and cooperative mechanism between the Resources Agency, CalEPA, federal agencies, local agencies, landowners, and environmental groups. Results will help determine how to improve the coordination among agencies and other interested parties in the implementation of watershed protection programs.

**SELECTED WATERSHED PROJECTS / GROUPS / PROGRAMS:** (NORTH TO SOUTH)

1. Humboldt Bay Watershed Action Plan and Enhancement Plan (Humboldt Co.)
2. Yuba Watershed Collaborative Projects (Nevada Co.)
3. Clear Lake Basin Watershed Management Project (Lake Co.)
4. Tomaes Bay/ Lagunitas Creek (Marin Co.)
5. Codornices Creek Watershed Restoration Action Plan (Alameda Co.)
6. Santa Clara Basin Watershed Management Initiative (Santa Clara Co.)
7. Elkhorn Slough Watershed Permit Coordination Program (Monterey Co.)
8. Arroyo Seco Watershed Restoration Feasibility Study (Los Angeles Co.)
9. Santa Ana River Watershed Program (Orange Co.)
10. Los Peñasquitos Lagoon Enhancement Plan and Program (San Diego Co.)

**SCHEDULE**

July – August 2001	-	Perform interviews with 10 case studies
September 2001	-	Present Findings to Advisory Committee / Task Force
October 2001	-	Public Review of Draft Report
November 2001	-	Revised Report for RA & SWRCB review
January 2002	-	Final report prepared and printed
Feb. 1, 2002	-	Final report due to Legislature

**STAFF: MARIA REA & RENEE HOYOS, RESOURCES AGENCY; KEN COULTER,  
SWRCB; SARI SOMMARSTROM, UC BERKELEY (530) 467-5783.**

